

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-21 and 31-40 are pending. Claims 1, 20, 21 and 31 are amended to more particularly point out the distinctions over the cited art. Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the amendments and the arguments below.

**Election/Restriction**

Claims 32-40 have been withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner as being directed to a non-elected invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this requirement. Claims 22-30 were subject to a previous restriction requirement. These claims were canceled. Claims 32-40 were added and are dependent on elected claim 1. See MPEP 809. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the requirement for restriction.

**35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejection**

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants assume the Examiner intended the rejection for claim 31, which claims the computer readable medium. Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner's interpretation, Applicants have amended the claim to obviate this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection**

Claims 1-21 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheifler et al. (US Patent 6,138,238) in view of Colburn et al. (US Patent 6,173,404). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Scheifler and Colburn, individually and in combination, teach away from the present invention as claimed. The Examiner states:

by combining Colburn with Scheifler's above teaching of implied permission, the resulting combination further teaches the target object implementing access authorization in association with implied permission to other interfaces. Office Action, p. 4.

However, teaching "the target object implementing access authorization in association with implied permission to other interfaces" is not what is claimed. Both Scheifler and Colburn

determined security measures using a centralized authority to determine those security measures. Neither determines security measures at a target object. For example, Scheifler discloses the use of permission objects (which are not target objects) “which determine whether a requested permission is authorized by the particular permission represented by the permission object.” Col. 11, lines 56-57. Colburn’s security measures are determined by “attributes obtained from the call stack to determine whether particular conditions are met to permit an accessing instance to access a particular target.” Col. 8, lines 65-67. In other words, the target objects within Colburn or Scheifler do not make any security determinations and certainly do not make any security determinations based on the target object own security policies.

Moreover, Scheifler’s disclosure of implied permission does not constitute determining access to other interface of a target object as the Examiner implies. Scheifler explicitly states:

If a permission is represented by a permission object, the validation method for the permission object contains code for determining whether one permission is implied by another. For example, a permission to write to any file in a directory implies a permission to write to any specific file in that directory, and a permission to read from any file in a directory implies a permission to read from any specific file in that directory. However, a permission to write does not imply a permission to read. Col. 12, lines 46-55.

Scheifler’s determination does not occur at the target object. The determination occurs at a permission object (a centralized authority), which teaches away from the present claims. Second, interface permissions in the present invention as claimed are not implied. Each interface may grant varying degrees of access to the target object. See e.g., Specification para. [0058]. Access to one interface does not imply access to another interface. Third, as Scheifler explicitly states above, the permission object contains code for determining whether one permission is implied by another. The present invention as claimed does not determine whether a permission is implied based on another permission. Rather the target object determines whether access to a particular interface based on a call to the first interface by checking its own security policies. See e.g., para. [0058].

Scheifler and Colburn, individually and in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element of the claims. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

**Conclusion**

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly addressed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding rejections and allow the present claims. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: July 3, 2009

By: /Shawn Diedtrich/  
Shawn Diedtrich  
Registration No. 58,176  
Direct: 480.704.4615

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810  
Los Angeles, CA 90069  
(310) 247-2860